



## ISSUE 2

2. Did defendant Puma Biotechnology, Inc. act with actual malice when it accused plaintiff Fredric N. Eshelman of being “replaced as CEO of PPD” after being “involved in clinical trial fraud”?

ANSWER: ✓ Yes        No

**If you answered “Yes” to Issues 1 and 2, answer Issue 3.**

**If you answered “No” to Issue 1 or Issue 2, then the case is over. The foreperson should date and sign the verdict form.**

## ISSUE 3

3. What amount of compensatory damages is plaintiff Fredric N. Eshelman entitled to recover from defendant Puma Biotechnology, Inc.?

\$ 15,050,000.

**These are our unanimous answers. So say we all. This 15 day of March 2019.**

REDACTED VERSION

Pursuant to the E-Government Act and the federal rules, the unredacted version of this document has been filed under seal.

Signature of Foreperson